

DRAWING AMENDMENTS

The attached drawing sheet includes changes to FIG. 6. This sheet replaces the original sheet. In FIG. 6, typographical errors in equation:

$$if \left(\left(\left(LDR^N - LSR_i^N \right) \bmod N \right) < M \right)$$

have been corrected to recite,

$$if \left(\left(\left(LDS^N - LES_i^N \right) \bmod N \right) < M \right).$$

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 3-5, 13, and 14 are allowable if rewritten in independent form and claims 19 and 24 are allowable if the §112 rejections are overcome.

Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-26 remain pending in the instant application. Claims 1, 2, 6-12, and 15-26 presently stand rejected. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 15, and 17-26 are amended herein. Claims 2 and 13 are hereby cancelled without prejudice. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Specification

The Examiner is thanked for bringing to Applicants' attention that on page 2, line 23, the word "If" should be "In." And also on page 7, line 4, the word "check" should be "checks." Accordingly, Applicants have corrected the specification to cure these minor formalities.

Drawings

FIG. 6 has been amended to cure inadvertent typographical errors in the equation associated with "check #3."

Claim Objections

Claims 7, 15, and 25 have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns. The objection is claim 14 is now moot, since independent claim 9 has been amended to incorporate the elements of dependent claim 13 (now cancelled).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 17-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner stated that the phrase "machine-accessible medium" is unclear. While Applicants do not agree that the phrase "machine-accessible medium" is unclear, in order to promote prosecution, Applicants have amended the preambles of claims 17-26 to recite "computer-accessible storage medium."

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fedorkow et al. (US 7,230,917).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element of the claim is found in a single reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.” M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter of dependent claim 2 (now cancelled) and claim 3 previously deemed allowable. Accordingly, claim 1 now includes allowable subject matter.

Consequently, Fedorkow fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2131. Withdrawal of the instant §102 rejection of claim 1 is requested.

The dependent claims are novel over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with their respective independent claims, in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the instant § 102 rejections of the dependent claims be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fedorkow et al. in view of Stiliadis et al. (US 6,134,217).

Claims 9-12, 15-18, 20, 22, 23, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fedorkow et al. in view of Ellsworth et al. (US 6,131,113).

“To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Independent claim 9 has been amended to include the elements of dependent claim 13 (now cancelled) deemed allowable by the Examiner. Accordingly, claim 9 now includes allowable subject matter.

Independent claim 17 has been amended to include the elements of dependent claim 13 (now cancelled) deemed allowable by the Examiner. Accordingly, claim 17 now includes allowable subject matter.

Consequently, the combination of Fedorkow and Stiliadis fails to teach or suggest all elements of claims 9 and 17, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Applicants request that the instant §103(a) rejections of claims 1 and 17 be withdrawn.

The dependent claims are nonobvious over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with their respective independent claims, in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the instant § 103 rejections of the dependent claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the applicable rejections have been overcome and all claims remaining in the application are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at (206) 292-8600 if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Please credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: Jan. 2, 2008

/Cory G. Claassen/

Cory G. Claassen

Reg. No. 50,296

Phone: (206) 292-8600

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040